Chapter 15

Language and Ethnicity

ANGELA REYES

Language and ethnicity research in education is motivated by several concerns. Some sociolinguists are chiefly interested in ethnic minority achievement in the classroom, exploring the role of language in educational success and failure. Others are primarily concerned with ethnic dialects and ethnic minority languages, examining the role of schools in valuing and supporting linguistic varieties with minimal institutional legitimacy. Still others are mainly fascinated by youth interactional practices, using educational sites to witness the constant doing and undoing of ethnic groups and boundaries through language use. Oftentimes these various concerns overlap, providing complex accounts of how linguistic, ethnic and educational issues are elaborately intertwined. In this chapter, I discuss definitions of ethnicity, sociolinguistic research methods in language and ethnicity, and language and ethnicity research by ethnic group and by educational site. I end with suggestions for future research as well as implications for language educators.

Definitions of Ethnicity

The concept of ethnicity can be quite vexing. What is frustrating about ethnicity and associated concepts (like race and culture) is that they refer to nothing, that is, no *thing*, making these terms essentially – and existentially – indefinable. Unlike words like 'apple' that more straightforwardly index objects, ethnicity is something you just can't grab and bite into. This intangible quality provides much variability in how ethnicity is understood, valued and applied. Even though scientists generally agree that there is no biological evidence to support their importance, ethnicity and race are still commonly perceived as primordial and natural categories. Since it is people – not genetics or nature – that insist on the significance of these categories in the classification of human beings (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985), several scholars argue that ethnicity and race are *social constructs* with great *political significance*. Because these constructs play a

major role in how individuals experience and structure their social worlds, researchers need to pay particular attention to the ways in which ethnicity and race are defined and operationalized in institutional and everyday contexts, especially with regard to linguistic and educational practice.

Since it has been established that ethnicity and race are socially constructed and not biologically determined, what exactly does this 'social construction' involve? How do people understand ethnicity and race, and what do they do with these concepts? According to Waters (1990), people commonly associate ethnicity with distinctions based on national origin, language, religion, food and other cultural markers, and link race to distinctions drawn from physical appearance, such as skin color, hair texture, eye shape and so on. Omi and Winant similarly argue that people construct race in reference to 'different types of human bodies' (Omi & Winant, 1994: 55). This mutual emphasis on perceptions of race as based on phenotypic features, however, has been called into question. Bailey (2002), for example, reveals how Dominican Americans construct identities not on the basis of phenotype but on the basis of language. Although others may perceive them in racial terms (i.e. 'Black'), Dominican Americans construct their identities along ethnolinguistic lines (i.e. 'Spanish'). How mixed-race people are identified and identify themselves also disrupts the phenotype-based approach to racial classification (Bucholtz, 1995). As for ethnicity, the concept is more than 'muddy' (Omi & Winant, 1994: 14), being composed of equally muddy parts, such as culture, language, nation and so on. Understandings of ethnicity fall apart when confronted by groups that accrue complicated transnational identities, such as Puerto Ricans (Zentella, 1997), Japanese returnees (Kanno, 2003), 1.5 generation immigrants who experience part of their formative years in one country and part in another country (Reyes, 2007), and many ethnic minorities who are often positioned as not fully part of either a 'heritage culture' or a 'host country' (Jo, 2001).

It is not enough to say that these groups combine 'multiple' ethnicities or 'two' races, because such statements presuppose that ethnic and racial categories are discrete and pure units to begin with. Even in the most seemingly homogeneous and stable communities, concepts of ethnicity and race do not stand still. Rather, because of past and present mixing, meeting, moving and imagining across national and cultural boundaries, ethnicity and race are more aptly described as ongoing, dynamic processes. Efforts to define ethnicity and race by their content thus ultimately fail, revealing instead how slippery and elusive these categories are.

Hence, several scholars are interested not in the content of ethnic groups but in the construction of ethnic boundaries. Barth (1969), who formulates ethnicity as a function of boundary maintenance, is concerned not with the internal inventories of groups but with how groups create borders between them. Hewitt similarly emphasizes how ethnicity is 'a positional concept,

for it has its existence only in relation to other cultures bound within specific political and economic systems' (Hewitt, 1986: 162). Much sociolinguistic research examines the complex ways in which boundaries between ethnic groups are locally constituted, revealing how ethnic identity is not a fixed property of individuals but a social achievement produced through interaction. Rampton (1995), for example, examines how ethnically diverse peer groups problematize the formation and maintenance of ethnicity. He argues that adolescents transgress ethnic boundaries by crossing into languages associated with other ethnic groups, creating 'new ethnicities' (cf. Hall, 1988; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982), which are produced through emergent communities in contact and thus predicated on difference and diversity, not on primordial bonds. Other studies reveal how different ethnic identities become established within what seems to be a single ethnic group: For example, Mendoza-Denton (1996) shows how Mexican American gang girls identify as either 'Sureñas' (linked to the Spanish-dominant first generation) or 'Norteñas' (linked to the English-dominant second generation), and Kang (2004) reveals how Korean American camp counselors constitute themselves as either 'Korean' (linked to teaching cultural heritage) or 'Korean American'(linked to being a mentor). Studies such as these reveal how ethnicity cannot be defined by what it consists of; rather, ethnic identities shift across interactional contexts in relation to the local ideological divisions that are created between groups.

Ethnicity concerns not just boundaries and mutability, but also power relations, group hierarchies and institutional structures. Who gets defined as 'ethnic', for example, becomes a question with great consequence for how national belonging is conceived and how racial hierarchies are reproduced. Consider what gets included in 'multicultural day' at a school and under 'ethnic restaurants' in a phone book. Oftentimes dominant groups are excluded from these areas because of their unmarked, normative status against which minority groups are unequally positioned (Trechter & Bucholtz, 2001). Such ethnic designations assigned from outside the group are called 'ethnic categories', while designations established from within are called 'ethnic groups' (Jenkins, 1994). Political mobilization may motivate the acceptance of a label from the inside, turning an ethnic category into an ethnic group. For example, 'Asian American', a label that was once imposed and then embraced, became a powerful unifying force for Asian ethnic groups during the Civil Rights Movement in the United States. Such pan-ethnicity, which is the merging of groups of different national origins into new large-scale groupings, was created not on the basis of shared cultural ties but on collective social action against institutionalized inequality (Espiritu, 1992). Ethnicity, thus, achieves extraordinary political importance, not only as it can be deeply rooted in various institutions that may reproduce unequal power relations, but also as it can be creatively appropriated by minority groups as a catalyst for social change.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that ethnicity is not universally understood. The very construction of ethnicity can vary across contexts and can have a multitude of meanings. To be 'black', for example, means something entirely different in the United States than it does in France (Tetreault, 2008), in Brazil (Roth-Gordon, 2007), and so on. Such variation occurs not only across large national scales: ethnicity can be conceptualized in different ways inside national borders as well as within the same community. Moreover, these conceptualizations can change over time or shift in a single interaction. Across and within contexts, ethnicity can also be intertwined with other aspects of identity or have little to no relevance altogether (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993). Researchers must ask why priority should be given to ethnicity, lest they risk a view of 'ethnic absolutism' (Gilroy, 1987), which privileges a fairly static view of ethnicity as more crucial to one's identity than other social categories, such as class, gender, age, and so on.

Methodological Approaches to the Study of Language and Ethnicity

All of the complexity that surrounds the concept of ethnicity may easily overwhelm the researcher. A sociolinguistic approach to the study of ethnicity is ideal for at least three reasons. First, since ethnicity is a social construct, this social construction must involve communication in some way, whether it is language or other semiotic means. Sociolinguists specialize in the collection and analysis of such communication. Second, attending to the role of language in the constitution of ethnic groups and boundaries grounds the researcher in empirical data. Ethnicity becomes observable, allowing researchers to gain a rich understanding of how individuals themselves understand and utilize ethnicity in their daily lives. Third, examining linguistic practices forces researchers to attend to ethnicity as accomplished through situationally bound practices. Sociolinguists can trace the intricacy of ethnic identity as it changes and shifts over time and across contexts, enabling fuller accounts of how ethnicity operates. There are different methodological approaches that sociolinguists employ in the study of ethnicity, and below I outline a few.

Several scholars in the field of sociolinguistics approach the study of language and ethnicity with a distinctiveness-centered model. This model enables the classification of ethnic dialects, allowing researchers to describe in close detail the linguistic features of distinct speech varieties spoken by particular ethnic groups. The distinctiveness-centered model has been adopted by sociolinguists who take a more quantitative approach to the study of language and ethnicity. Much of the early work on African-American English (AAE), for example, falls into this paradigm (e.g. Labov, 1972). Research on Latino English has also relied heavily on quantitative

approaches to describe Latino varieties in similar detail (e.g. Fought, 2003). This work has been enormously important in revealing how ethnic varieties are indeed just as grammatical as other speech varieties, including standard varieties. This finding is particularly useful to language educators. Research showing how AAE, for example, is a legitimate variety informs language debates in education, such as the Ebonics controversy (see below). Quantitative work is crucial for understanding how linguistic features are spread across large communities of speakers, and how a particular ethnic dialect is systematic within and across speakers. However, a criticism of quantitative research is that it lacks rich, nuanced accounts of speaker repertoires as they are performed and understood across a wide range of contexts. Moreover, while this work has made an immense impact on how we understand language variation, ethnic groups who do not have a distinctive speech variety are largely ignored within this paradigm.

Other research has shown that issues of language and ethnicity should be concerned not only with the distinctiveness of ethnic varieties, but also with the performance of multiple speech styles in the construction of ethnicity. Taking a more qualitative, ethnographic approach, several sociolinguists explore the ways in which speakers draw on features of ethnic dialects (whether real or imagined) in the production of identity. Much of this research emphasizes improvised aspects of language use, for example, codeswitching (Gumperz, 1982; see also Kamwangamalu, this volume), stylization (Coupland, 2001; see also Jaspers, this volume) and the use of linguistic features associated with an ethnic other, which can be found in studies on language crossing (Rampton, 1995) and mocking (Hill, 1995). Several researchers in this tradition gather data in educational settings since youth interactional practices are particularly rich sites for witnessing this type of language play (e.g. Bailey, 2002). Ethnographic approaches are also enormously important for exploring issues of language and ethnicity among ethnic groups that do not speak a distinct dialect or at least one that is widely recognized (Reyes & Lo, 2009). Some challenges faced by the ethnographic approach include difficulty in describing speech patterns across large numbers of speakers and in producing generalizable findings.

I wish not to present these two approaches as mutually exclusive or in opposition to one another. In fact, many ethnographers must rely on quantitative research when they examine the emergence and significance of linguistic features that get linked to ethnic groups. In addition, there have been many studies that combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches to produce rich, detailed accounts of language and ethnicity in particular communities of practice (e.g. Alim, 2004; Mendoza-Denton, 2008).

Finally, there is a long tradition in sociolinguistic research that concentrates on ethnic minority languages, language shift and maintenance and language planning and policy (e.g. Fishman, 1989; Gal, 1979; Hornberger,

1988). Much of this work is concerned with issues of multilingualism and efforts to revitalize endangered languages. Scholars typically conduct long-term ethnographic studies in an area of the world, document the ways in which two or more language varieties are used and perceived at home, community, institutional and societal levels and situate their research within broader frameworks of educational policy and language politics. Schools and classrooms are often key sites in these studies since issues of language teaching and learning are central to these investigations (e.g. Heller, 1999; Jaffe, 1999).

Language and Ethnicity in the United States

It is impossible to discuss in this chapter all of the ethnic groups that have been the subject of language and ethnicity research. Because of space limitations and because of my own area of expertise, I have thus chosen to focus this section on only a few groups in the United States. This section is also further restricted to issues of language and ethnicity that involve the English language in some way, whether I am discussing ethnic dialects of English, issues of English language contact and shift in ethnic communities or the use of English language varieties in the production of ethnicity.

I would like to emphasize that there is extremely valuable research going on outside of what I explore in this chapter that informs our understanding of language and ethnicity in the United States and in other parts of the world. Some examples of international work that is focused on issues of language and ethnicity and the English language include research in New Zealand (e.g. Holmes, 1997), India (e.g. Kachru, 1983), South Africa (e.g. Mesthrie, 2002), Hong Kong (e.g. Lin, 1996), England (e.g. Hewitt, 1986) and the Philippines (e.g. Bautista, 1997), to name just a mere few. Much – though certainly not all – cross-national research finds that speech varieties spoken by ethnic groups in less powerful positions are often stigmatized while the speech varieties spoken by dominant ethnic groups are not. Dominant group varieties are often institutionalized as the unmarked, normative standard, while subordinate group varieties accrue a litany of negative evaluations, such as 'bad', 'lazy', 'uneducated' and 'corrupt', resulting in a type of iconicity (Gal & Irvine, 1995) that maps such evaluations of speech onto the people who use that speech. But multilingual situations around the world can be quite complex and particular, revealing contexts where bilingualism may be more highly valued than a single language (e.g. Heller, 1999) and languages with limited institutional presence may gain prestige (e.g. Woolard, 1989).

In this section, I will provide brief overviews of language and ethnicity research on African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans and European Americans. For Native Hawaiians, see Siegel (this volume) on Hawai'i Creole English; for Jewish Americans, see Tannen

(1981); for Alaskan Athabaskans, see Scollon and Scollon (1981). There are, of course, several other ethnic groups in the United States, all of which are worthy of discussion. Due to space limitations and the focus of this chapter, I apologize for the inevitable omissions. Since most research in language and ethnicity has focused on African Americans, I will spend a longer time discussing this work, including the Oakland Ebonics controversy, which has particular relevance to language educators.

African Americans

The speech practices of African slave descendents in the United States have received an enormous amount of attention from sociolinguists over the past half-century. Much of this research is focused on the description and analysis of the distinct ethnic variety that is linked to African American speakers. Over the years, this variety has been referred to by several names: for example, Black English Vernacular, African American Vernacular English, AAE, African American Language and Ebonics. Although each name emphasizes different ideological stances that emerged within particular social climates (e.g. 'black' versus 'African American'; 'English' versus 'language'), many scholars see these terms as more or less synonymous. In this chapter, I follow Green (2002) and use 'African American English' (AAE) to emphasize that AAE is not limited to vernacular forms, but comprises multiple styles that vary according to class, region, gender, age, situation, formality, and so on.

Debates surrounding the origin and future of AAE have preoccupied many sociolinguists. Some researchers argue that AAE originated from a creole (e.g. Dillard, 1972) and they support this claim with evidence from other English-based creoles around the world, including Gullah, which is spoken on the Sea Islands off the coast of Georgia and South Carolina (see Siegel, this volume). Others contend that AAE derives from the dialects of English spoken by early British and other western European settlers in the United States (e.g. Poplack & Tagliamonte, 1989). Scholars have also been concerned with whether AAE is converging with mainstream American English (MAE) and thus becoming more like MAE, or diverging from MAE and thus becoming even more different (e.g. Labov & Harris, 1986).

One of the most important things to know about AAE is that it is a systematic variety with well-defined linguistic rules. Table 15.1 presents just a sample of AAE linguistic features, which have been extensively catalogued in the literature. Some of these features are shared by other English dialects, but many researchers argue that they occur more frequently in AAE (Rickford, 1996). Not all African Americans speak AAE, and not all AAE speakers use AAE all the time. Scholars have found that AAE features occur more frequently in the informal speech of urban, working-class youth (Rickford, 1996). For example, Wolfram (1969) documents such

Table 15.1 Some linguistic features of African American English

Phonology and pronunciation	AAE example	MAE gloss
Simplification of word-final consonant clusters	Lef	Left
	Des	Desk
Realization of final ng as n in gerunds and participles	Talkin	Talking
Realization of voiceless th as t or f	Tin	Thin
	Baf	Bath
Realization of voiced th as d or v	Den	Then
	Bruvver	Brother
Stress on first rather than second syllable	Pólice	Police
Syntax and grammar		
Absence of third person present tense -s	He walk	He walks
	He don't sing	He doesn't sing
Use of invariant be to express habitual aspect	She be late	She is usually late
Absence of copula/auxiliary is and are for present tense states and actions	She late	She is late (today)
Use of done to emphasize the completed nature of an action	She done did it	She has already done it
Use of stressed BIN to express remote phase	He BIN married	He has been married for a long time (and still is)
Multiple negation or negative concord	He don't do nothing	He doesn't do anything

Source: Adapted from Rickford (1996: 175–176).

class stratification among AAE speakers in Detroit, and Labov (1972) illustrates how formality of context and familiarity with interlocutor influence the frequency of AAE features in the speech of African American boys in New York City. Females and middle-class speakers have largely been absent from much early work, as noted and corrected by several scholars (e.g. Morgan, 1991).

Oakland Ebonics controversy

It perhaps goes without saying that attitudes toward AAE have not been particularly kind. The general public rarely views AAE as a legitimate,

grammatical system; instead, AAE is often negatively evaluated as 'ignorant', 'wrong', 'improper', and so on. These attitudes emerge through institutions, such as schools, where the stakes are high for students who speak AAE. In the 1979 Ann Arbor, Michigan case known as the Black English Trial, 11 African American plaintiffs had been placed in remedial special education classrooms based on evaluations that failed to take into account their linguistic heritage as speakers of AAE (Smitherman, 1981). The judge ruled that the negative attitudes of teachers toward the student vernacular constituted a barrier to equal educational opportunity. Although the judge ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, the main emphasis was on the need for better teacher training, while the practice of using speech pathology to classify AAE speakers as linguistically disabled remained unchallenged (Baugh, 1998).

Less than two decades after the Black English Trial, the Oakland Ebonics resolutions propelled the speech practices of African Americans into the national spotlight. In response to the poor educational performance of its African American students, the school board of Oakland, California, passed a resolution on December 18, 1996, embracing the potential of Ebonics in the teaching of standard English to AAE speakers (Baugh, 2000). This resolution was controversial for several reasons. First, Ebonics (literally: *black sounds*), a term that was unfamiliar to most people, was framed as 'genetically based' and 'not a dialect of English' in the original wording. The resolution was revised less than a month later to remove any reference to genetics and to concede that it was indeed an English dialect. Second, the original wording was ambiguous about the precise role of Ebonics in the classroom. It was not clear whether students would learn standard English through Ebonics, or whether students would be taught in Ebonics or even taught Ebonics. The revised resolution clarified that Ebonics would be used in the classroom to 'move' or 'transition' students from Ebonics to standard English proficiency. Table 15.2 compares two excerpts from the original and amended resolutions, which reveal these changes.

The Oakland Ebonics case has several educational implications for students who speak AAE. Particularly since the resolution legitimized the role of Ebonics in the classroom, it opened up new opportunities for educators to incorporate AAE in the teaching of standard English. One approach, Contrastive Analysis, is considered bidialectal since it focuses on particular points of contrast between the two varieties. Contrasting AAE and standard English in both directions – from AAE to standard English and from standard English to AAE – is crucial, since moving only from AAE to standard English suggests an unequal status between languages (Rickford & Rickford, 2000). While drills can quickly become tedious, scholars point to the effectiveness of other methods that use, for example, literature, which also illustrates how acclaimed authors like Toni Morrison use AAE features in their profession. Delpit (2006) describes

Table 15.2 Excerpts from the Oakland Ebonics resolutions

December 18, 1996	January 15, 1997
WHEREAS, these studies have also demonstrated that African Language Systems *are genetically based* and *not a dialect of English*; and	WHEREAS, these studies have also demonstrated that African Language Systems *have origins in West and Niger-Congo languages* and *are not merely dialects of English*; and
WHEREAS, the standardized tests and grade scores of African-American students in reading and language arts skills measuring their application of English skills are substantially below state and national norms and that such deficiencies will be remedied by application of a program featuring African Language Systems principles *in instructing African-American children both in their primary language and in English*; and	WHEREAS, the standardized tests and grade scores of African-American students in reading and language arts skills measuring their application of English skills are substantially below state and national norms and that such deficiencies will be remedied by application of a program featuring African Language Systems principles *to move students from the language patterns they bring to school to English proficiency*; and

Source: Adapted from Rickford and Rickford (2000: 166–169).

several other creative teaching strategies that involve puppet shows, role-playing, theater and the creation of bilingual dictionaries, to name just a few. Rickford (1999) notes that several classroom studies have shown that AAE speakers acquire standard English proficiency more successfully when AAE is integrated in its learning; in fact, some studies have found that if AAE is not incorporated, the presence of AAE features increases in academic tasks where standard English is preferred (Taylor, 1989). Yet if teachers, administrators, students and parents do not recognize and value AAE as a legitimate variety, such negative attitudes may be the main barrier to its efficacy in the classroom. Rickford (1999) urges educators to proceed from the position that AAE speakers come to school having already mastered a linguistic system and are now learning to master another.

Latinos

Although the majority of language and ethnicity research in the United States has focused on African Americans, Latinos have also attracted a great deal of attention from sociolinguists. Much research on Mexican Americans (e.g. Mendoza-Denton, 2008), Puerto Rican Americans (e.g. Urciuoli, 1996), Dominican Americans (e.g. Bailey, 2002) and other Latino groups examines the complexity of ethnicity as it relates to language, race, nation, immigration and other social factors. Issues surrounding the Spanish language are often at the center of this research. Unlike AAE and standard English, which are typically viewed as varieties of the same

language, Spanish and English are commonly perceived as separate languages. There are several varieties of Spanish, however, and the tensions and hierarchies created among them can be quite fierce (Zentella, 2004). Because the use of Spanish and English varieties often plays important roles in the construction of ethnicity within Latino communities, research in this area is often centered on issues of bilingualism and codeswitching, which is the alternation between two (or more) language varieties in interaction (see Kamwangamalu, this volume). Certainly not all Latinos speak Spanish: while immigrant and second generation Latinos are often bilingual, it is not uncommon to find monolingual English-speaking Latinos in third and later generations (Fought, 2003). Whether Latinos speak Spanish or not, there are also other available resources for constructing ethnic identity, including Latino English varieties, such as Chicano English, and other ethnic varieties, including AAE.

Attitudes toward Spanish, bilingualism, codeswitching and Latino English varieties can be quite complex among Latino groups. While many Latinos view speaking Spanish as important – if not essential – to Latino ethnicity (Zentella, 1997), there are others who feel conflicted about the role of Spanish in their lives. This is not surprising given the overall negative attitudes toward Spanish and Spanish speakers in the United States. In the face of institutionalized discrimination ranging from mass media discourses that associate Spanish with being poor and uneducated to educational policies like Proposition 227, which essentially dismantled bilingual education in California in 1998, Latinos can hardly be blamed for shifting to English. Codeswitching between Spanish and English (often referred to as 'Spanglish') is still common among bilingual Latinos; and while embraced by Latino youth in particular, there is also a keen awareness that codeswitching is negatively viewed in institutions, such as schools (Urciuoli, 1996). The use of Latino English varieties also becomes important in the construction of ethnic identity for both bilingual and monolingual English-speaking Latinos. Chicano English, the most extensively studied Latino English variety, is spoken primarily by Mexican Americans in the Southwest (Fought, 2003). It initially emerged from language contact between Spanish and English varieties, but is now an ethnic dialect of English since it is learned as a native language (cf. pidgins and creoles, Siegel, this volume). Because Chicano English features can sound Spanish, Chicano English speakers are often mistakenly viewed as Spanish speakers who are learning English, even if they are monolingual English speakers (Fought, 2006).

Native Americans

In contrast to Latinos, who are united by a common linguistic heritage through Spanish, Indigenous tribal communities in the United States

speak distinct languages, although the numbers of Native American languages and their speakers are rapidly decreasing. Currently, the Native American languages with the most speakers are Navajo (approximately 130,000 speakers in Utah, Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico) followed far behind by Cherokee (approximately 14,000 speakers in North Carolina and Oklahoma) and other languages with around 10,000 speakers, including Lakhota, Apache, Pima and Tohono O'odham (Yamamoto & Zepeda, 2004). Before Europeans arrived on the shores of North America, there were an estimated 400–600 Native American languages that could be grouped into 62 language families (Goddard, 1996). In 1997, there were approximately 175 Native American languages being spoken in the United States; however, only about 20 of these were being learned by children (Krauss, 1998). This means that an alarming 155 of the remaining 175 languages are rapidly vanishing since they have no native speakers in the next generation. Over the past few decades, there have been efforts to revitalize these endangered languages, such as the creation of the Native American Languages Act in the early 1990s, which recognizes the importance of Native American languages and authorizes funds for language revitalization efforts. Several scholars, including Leanne Hinton, Ofelia Zepeda and Teresa McCarty, have also spearheaded community efforts to document languages, train teachers and develop materials. In addition, to meet the educational needs of Native American children, the Indian Education Act of 1972, which is an amendment of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, provides funds for programs serving Native American communities.

The historical oppression that Native Americans have endured through institutions like boarding schools led to the loss of tribal languages and to the emergence of distinctive linguistic features of Native American English. Leap (1993) explores the contours of this ethnic variety of English and the conditions that produced English fluency among Native Americans. Focusing on the off-reservation boarding schools, which were designed to 'civilize' Native American children away from their families, Leap examines how the sole use of English was highly regulated and brutally enforced. Speaking a Native American language was punishable through mouthwashing with soap, solitary confinement and whippings. Under such severe conditions, it is not surprising that students often acquired English, yet not necessarily at the expense of their tribal languages: students were known to devise covert opportunities to speak Native American languages in school spaces. Analyzing samples of student writing, Leap and others found that the English that Native American children were using shared features that made it distinct from the English they were learning at school. While Leap acknowledges how AAE in the 1600s and Pidgin English (spoken by Chinese American laborers) in the 1800s influenced the development of Native American English, he argues that this dialect cannot be

explained simply with reference to pidgin or creole features. Instead, he suggests that students were creating this ethnic variety from a range of linguistic and cultural skills, such as knowledge about language learned from teachers, from peers and from their ancestral languages.

Asian Americans

As with Native Americans, there is no single heritage language shared by Asian Americans, which include groups with origins as diverse as East Asia (e.g. China, Japan), South Asia (e.g. India and Sri Lanka) and Southeast Asia (e.g. Vietnam and Laos). But without a distinct ethnic dialect of English – like those found among African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans – Asian Americans remain one of the least studied ethnic groups in sociolinguistics (Reyes & Lo, 2004). Unlike Native Americans, who are indigenous to the Americas, and African Americans, who were forced into enslavement, Asian Americans – like Latinos – are often perceived as voluntary immigrants to the United States, although their histories are much more complex. From the first major influx of Chinese immigrants during the California gold rush in the mid-1800s to the latest waves of Southeast Asian refugees after the fall of Saigon in 1975, Asian Americans span a wide range of minority experiences even though three prevailing stereotypes suggest otherwise. According to the model minority stereotype (Lee, 1996), Asian Americans are mainstream American English speakers who assimilate smoothly into the white middle class. According to the forever foreigner stereotype (Tuan, 1998), Asian Americans are eternally perceived as newcomers who speak English with foreign accents. According to the problem minority stereotype (Reyes, 2007), Asian Americans – particularly Southeast Asian refugee youth – are seen as poor, urban minorities who participate in delinquent behavior, including the speaking of nonstandard dialects, such as AAE. The perception of Asian Americans as a homogeneous group motivates the willy-nilly application of these contradictory stereotypes, thus denying the complexity of Asian American lived experience and linguistic behavior.

Since efforts to identify an Asian American English have generally been inconclusive (Hanna, 1997; Mendoza-Denton & Iwai, 1993; Spencer, 1950), most sociolinguistic research on Asian Americans focuses on issues of English language learning and heritage language maintenance, although more recent scholarship explores the ways in which English is the main medium through which ethnic identity is produced. In studies on English language learning, researchers explore how Asian immigrants manage the English as a second language (ESL) classroom and ESL identity (e.g. Harklau, 1994). Much scholarship examines these issues in light of Lau v. Nichols, the landmark 1974 US Supreme Court case that ruled in favor of Chinese American students who were denied equal educational

opportunities due to the lack of educational services in Chinese. Research on heritage language programs, often called 'Saturday schools', has shown how the learning of a heritage language becomes intimately tied to a sense of ethnic heritage and the creation of hybrid ethnic identities (e.g. He & Xiao, 2008). Finally, research on the production of Asian American ethnicity through the use of English varieties poses an important challenge to the distinctiveness-centered sociolinguistic paradigm in language and ethnicity research. Even though they lack an ethnically distinct variety of English, Asian Americans can establish complex ethnic identities through the use of English, including nonstandard varieties such as AAE (e.g. Chun, 2001).

European Americans

Although the majority of language and ethnicity research is centered on ethnic minorities, sociolinguists are increasingly examining the language practices of European Americans and the linguistic construction of whiteness. As with African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans and Asian Americans, the ethnic identities of European Americans are also socially constructed. Consider, for example, how Italian and Irish immigrants in the early 20th century were once viewed as different racial groups and only over time have they both become perceived as 'white'. While studies have observed European American speech patterns in certain geographic regions and across particular socioeconomic backgrounds (e.g. Eckert, 2000), sociolinguists tend to be less interested in whether European Americans have a distinct dialect and more interested in how whiteness is ideologically constructed. Trechter and Bucholtz (2001) argue that whiteness maintains its power through its absence: it is through its unmarked status that whiteness becomes perceived as normative and other groups become relationally positioned as marginal and inferior. Hill (1999) illustrates this point with Mock Spanish, which is the use of Spanish words and phrases, such as *macho* or *hasta la vista*, by European Americans. She argues that in the construction of white public space, the Spanish spoken by Latinos is highly monitored while the Spanish performed by whites remains invisible as well as ideologically potent: Mock Spanish not only indexes desirable qualities for white users, but also reproduces negative racializing stereotypes of Latinos.

Several studies explore how whiteness becomes unhinged from its unmarked status through the construction of whiteness by both European Americans and non-European Americans. Studies have shown that whiteness becomes linked to linguistic factors, such as speaking standard English, and social factors, such as being middle class, educated and uncool. For example, it is not uncommon for ethnic minorities to be accused of 'acting white' or 'selling out' if they draw on standard features in academic or community contexts (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). But research

on European Americans finds that white identities can be produced regardless of the language variety being spoken. Whether using hyper-standard English in the production of a white 'nerd' identity (Bucholtz, 2001) or AAE in the making of white masculinity (Kiesling, 2001), white-ness in both cases becomes visible as it is constructed in relation to racial ideologies that link standard English to whites and nonstandard English to nonwhites. Research on non-European Americans ranges from elicita-tion studies, such as asking African Americans to imitate whites (Preston, 1992), to more spontaneous enactments, such as Native American 'white-man' jokes (Basso, 1979) or performances of white characters by African-American drag queens (Barrett, 1999) and stand-up comedians (Rahman, 2007). These studies reveal how whiteness is constructed and understood by minority groups, and how racial ideologies and hierarchies can be reproduced and challenged through interaction.

Language and Ethnicity in Education

Now that basic overviews of a few ethnic groups in the United States have been discussed, I will turn to an exploration of issues of language and ethnicity in educational contexts. There are three main models in lan-guage and ethnicity research in education: deficit, difference and emer-gence. Some early work drew on a deficit model, claiming that ethnic minorities experienced chronic school failure because they were cogni-tively deficient and culturally deprived. These claims were completely discredited when studies drawing on a difference model explained how ethnic minorities are not deficient, but socialized into different sets of cul-tural norms that are not recognized or legitimized by mainstream schools. Other work draws on an emergence model, describing how ethnic groups and educational institutions do not possess static characteristics as much as they are in constant negotiation with one another in particular school contexts. This section will focus on classic studies that draw on difference models and more recent research that draws on emergence models. I will not review studies that fall into a deficit model since this work has been invalidated, although it is a model that unfortunately is still found in public discourse.

Difference model

Two pioneering studies on language and ethnicity in the classroom by Susan Philips (1983) and Shirley Brice Heath (1983) argue that minority student failure largely results from a mismatch in speech norms. Using the ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1974), both Philips and Heath carried out multi-year studies that explore how ethnic minorities are socialized into particular speech norms in the home and community that differ from those in the school.

In her ethnography of the Warm Springs Indian reservation in Oregon from 1968 to 1973, Philips finds that verbal participation among Native American and Anglo children varies profoundly in the classroom. She argues that the Native American children have difficulties at school because the 'participant structures' in the classroom are different from those in their community. These participant structures include whole class, small group and one-to-one interactions. In small groups with classmates and in individual interactions with the teacher, the Native American chil-dren participate more actively because these two participant structures more closely resemble those in the community. In whole class activities, however, the ways in which Native American children structure attention in terms of eye gaze, turns at talk, and so on, lead to misunderstandings and negative evaluations by the teacher (see also Rymes, this volume).

Drawing from research in the Piedmont Carolinas from 1969 to 1978, Heath provides an ethnographic account of language socialization in Trackton, a black working class community, and Roadville, a white work-ing class community. She finds that children from Trackton and Roadville are socialized into speech norms that are distinct not only from each other, but also from the nearby mainstream community. The mainstream chil-dren benefit from having their speech styles valued in the classroom, while the working class children are continually failed by school. For example, the African American children of Trackton are not socialized into answer-ing known-information questions (e.g. 'what color is this?' when asked by someone who can clearly see the color). This interactional routine is a pre-ferred and pervasive one in the classroom as well as in the communities of mainstream children. When Trackton children do not partake in these questioning routines, teachers interpret their nonparticipation as resis-tance or ignorance.

These two studies illustrate how being socialized into different speech norms can result in the marginalization of ethnic minority children at school. Rather than promoting a view of ethnic minorities as deficient, Philips and Heath argue that the interactional conventions of each com-munity are just as systematic and coherent as those of the dominant group. These studies reveal how ethnic majority groups establish and maintain power by having their speech norms legitimized in institutional settings, such as classrooms. Mainstream practices become accepted as 'normal', 'proper' and 'standard'. Meanwhile, ethnic minority norms become misunderstood or negatively evaluated. Although educational institutions tend not to effectively accommodate ethnic minority groups, some studies have documented school efforts to incorporate community speech norms into classroom practice, such as the Hawaiian 'talk story' in reading lessons (Au, 1980). But oftentimes, mainstream schools insist that competence in dominant speech norms be a prerequisite to full access to American society.

Emergence model

There is educational research that departs from the difference model to embrace a more emergent account of language and ethnicity. This work emphasizes how the link between language and ethnicity is quite dynamic: that speakers are not confined to a set of inherited speech norms, but may draw instead from wide repertoires and various interactional strategies in the performance of ethnic identity (see Kasper & Omori, this volume, on emergent cultural identities). While these studies recognize that socialization greatly influences interactional behavior, they also criticize the difference model for overemphasizing its role and for risking a view of cultural determinism (Erickson & Shultz, 1982; McDermott & Gospodinoff, 1981; Rampton, 1995). Much of this work, in fact, sees difference based on ethnicity as secondary to difference based on political relations between groups. I will discuss some key studies that take an emergent account by focusing on site: mainstream education and language education.

Mainstream education

There are several studies that effectively illustrate how the identities of ethnic minorities are not simply brought to school, but emergent through classroom practice. In her study of Latino primary school children in classroom writing workshops, Orellana (1999) stresses the inventiveness of social identities through written literacy practices. Although all of the students have dark hair and dark eyes, they strongly identify with the blond-haired, blue-eyed characters that they invent in their stories. While the creation of such Anglo images by Latino children may be interpreted as compliant with dominant racial discourses, Orellana argues that these drawings are more likely forms of resistance, allowing students to challenge stereotypes about what Latinos should look like. Drawing from data in a ninth grade classroom in a public high school, Wortham (2006) focuses on the emergent identities of two African American students: Tyisha and Maurice. Considering curricular themes, ideologies of race and gender and the local models of personhood available to students (most notably 'promising girls' and 'unpromising boys'), Wortham closely analyzes classroom interaction across time to trace how student identities develop and shift in unexpected ways. Tyisha, for example, comes to be socially identified in wildly distinct ways despite the fact that she performs a relatively stable identity throughout the academic year: as an outspoken student, expressing and defending her opinions. Tyisha moves from promising to problematic, as more students begin speaking out in class. She then moves from a disruptive outcast to a legitimate dissenter, as curricular themes about individual sacrifice and then reasoned resistance come forth, thus enabling her to inhabit recognizable models of personhood that are introduced in the classroom. Both Orellana and Wortham reveal that students are not confined to fixed models of language

and ethnicity. Instead, various identities may become possible in and through the classroom.

There are also several studies that examine the manipulation of ethnically defined speech norms in the strategic display of identity. When ethnic minorities view access to mainstream success through the adoption of mainstream conventions as an illusion, they may maintain even more strict adherence to group-defining norms. For example, Foley (1996) finds that Native American high school students will actively apply the 'silent Indian' stereotype to themselves in order to avoid being bothered by their teachers in the classroom. This enactment of nonparticipation is a result not so much of being socialized into silence in the community, but of knowing that this is a stereotype that circulates and can be inhabited to achieve a particular interactional effect. Fordham (1999) documents two linguistic strategies among African American high school students: 'guerilla warfare' or the strict adherence to the use of AAE in all contexts including the classroom; and 'leasing the standard' in educational contexts while 'retaining ownership of Ebonics' in others. Speaking standard English often elicits accusations of 'acting white', a notion that is tied to hegemony because the students may be seen as agents in their own oppression. Despite these negative evaluations, this style of 'accommodation without assimilation' (Gibson, 1988) becomes a prevalent strategy for the high-achieving African American students in her study.

Finally, work on language crossing in educational contexts is also concerned with the manipulation of multiple ethnic varieties in the production of ethnic identity. This line of research concerns itself with the politics and elasticity of ethnic group boundaries when speakers use language varieties associated with an ethnic other. In his groundbreaking study of multiethnic peer group interaction at an urban middle school in England, Rampton (1995) discusses the out-group use of Panjabi, Creole and Stylized Asian English by Afro-Caribbean, Anglo and Panjabi youth. Language crossing emerges as a multi-vocalic practice with different social meanings depending on the speaker and the language. For example, Panjabi youth cross into Creole, which is spoken primarily by Afro-Caribbean immigrants in England, because it stands for an excitement in youth culture. Rampton argues that Creole crossing is an example of self/voice entanglement. This interlacing of speakers (Panjabi youth) with what they spoke (Creole) signals favorable evaluations of Creole and reflects positively on Panjabi youth. In her ethnographic study of a multiracial urban high school in California, Bucholtz (1999) documents similar types of language crossing in her analysis of stylized performances of AAE by white males. In stories about interracial conflict, Bucholtz finds that the use of AAE positions black masculinity with physical prowess, yet maintains the racial hierarchy that enables white appropriation of African American cultural forms. Both Rampton and Bucholtz consider such political

dimensions when youth transgress ethnic boundaries in the construction of identities that defy fixed notions of language and ethnicity.

Language education

Language classrooms are perhaps obvious sites where questions of language and ethnicity become central. Unlike mainstream classrooms in which adherence to mainstream norms is often expected, language classrooms often assume – if not insist – that ethnicity play a role in the teaching and learning of language. Leung *et al.* challenge such assumptions about ethnicity in the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) through their critique of the 'idealized native speaker'. Particularly in multiethnic urban areas, they question the blanket assumption that ethnic groups simply inherit language traditions:

> a significant number of ethnic minority adolescent pupils demonstrate a weak sense of affiliation to their supposed home/community L1 ... In addition, other ethnic minorities may claim affiliation to linguistic varieties that are supposed to be part of the natural inheritance of other ethnic groups ... At the same time a similar tendency is also visible among ethnic majority pupils ... And there is evidence that some White pupils have a weak affiliation with standard English and use nonstandard forms by choice. (Leung *et al.*, 1997: 557)

Reviewing studies that similarly embrace how ethnicity is produced rather than given, this section covers language and ethnicity research in a variety of language education settings, including second language, foreign language, heritage language, bilingual and dual-language classrooms.

Much research examines the complex emergence of ethnic minority identities in contexts of language education. Drawing from a four-year ethnographic study of a Spanish-English bilingual high school in New York City, Bartlett (2007) examines how the identity of a Dominican immigrant girl, Maria, shifts over time. Bartlett argues that Maria is able to escape the limits of the student with interrupted formal education (SIFE) label and inhabit a 'good student' identity, partly because the local model of success grants high status to Spanish language and literacy. In their two-year ethnographic study of ESL students in a junior high school in California, McKay and Wong (1996) use the concept of investment to explore how four Chinese-speaking immigrant youth invest in the target language as well as in their social identities. McKay and Wong examine how the students adopt various strategies – such as resistance, accommodation and inhabiting the 'quiet Asian' stereotype – to deal with the asymmetrical power relations within which they are unfavorably positioned. In their study of a Spanish-English dual-language program in Arizona, González and Arnot-Hopffer (2003) discuss the relationships between biliteracy development, language ideologies and conceptions of ethnicity

among three second grade girls. One girl, Jessica, who comes from a Spanish-dominant home, shifts the ethnic labels she uses to refer to herself: *Blanco* (white), *Mexicana* (Mexican), *Nada* (nothing) and *Mexicana-Americana* (Mexican American). Gonzalez and Arnot-Hopffer discuss these changing terms of ethnic self-reference in light of English language hegemony and shifting language ideologies: in kindergarten, Jessica rejects Spanish, but by second grade, she embraces it as *mi idioma* (my language). Studies on codeswitching in contexts of language education also shed light on emergent identities in response to linguistic hegemony. This work reveals ethnic minority responses to the symbolic domination of a language, such as English (Lin, 1996) or a prestigious variety of French (Heller, 1999).

In heritage language learning contexts where the teacher and students seem to share a common ethnic background, several studies examine how ethnic identities form as language authority in the classroom emerges. In her study of a Korean heritage language program in California, Lo (2004) finds that divisions of ethnic identity among students emerge through shifting epistemic stances of moral evaluation by the teacher. For students who conform to the cultural expectations of a good Korean student, the teacher portrays her access to their thoughts and feelings as more distant and uncertain. For students who do not conform to these expectations, the teacher represents their emotions as self-evident displays of affect. These different authoritative stances produce distinct Korean models of student identification. In a Chinese heritage language classroom, He (2004) examines the emergence of authority around the choice of scripts: *jiantizi*, the simplified official script used in mainland China, and *fantizi*, the traditional script normally used in Taiwan and elsewhere. In teacher–student interaction about which script to use in the classroom, He finds that the expert–novice relationship shifts as teacher authority is not always presupposed to the same degree nor is it always accepted by the students. In her study of Korean American heritage language learners in a university Korean foreign language classroom, Jo (2001) examines the tension between student knowledge of informal Korean and teacher expectations of standard Korean. The informal linguistic variations of students lose their authority once the teacher who represents native authenticity declares that their variations are not standard. While these heritage language learners might be seen as doubly marginalized by both 'native' Korean and English language authorities, Jo argues that students take from both traditions and create new linguistic forms that cross boundaries between different categories of ethnicity and language.

Several studies examine the political consequences when the stigmatization of ethnic groups in language education contexts results in identity divisions. In her ethnography of a French language high school in Toronto, Heller (1999) argues that the politics of identity are shifting from a model

rooted in ethnic and linguistic unity to a new model characterized by economic interest and pluralism. Linguistic varieties and language ideologies play important roles in the division of students and in the marginalization of both the 'Quebec students', who are monolingual speakers of the legitimized yet stigmatized Quebec French Vernacular, and the 'Colonized French students', who are monolingual speakers of Standard European French. In a high school ESL class in Hawaii, Talmy (2004) examines how Asian and Pacific Islander ESL students manage the stigmatization of the 'FOB' label (fresh off the boat). He finds that they avoid being positioned as FOB by positioning a newcomer classmate as FOB instead. While the students have successfully escaped the confines of this derogatory label, they have also played a role in the local reproduction of this hierarchical system, which continues to stigmatize students based on ideas of the exoticized cultural and linguistic Other.

Another area of research explores how ethnic varieties can be the target language for immigrant groups. In the field of second language acquisition, there is an assumption that the target variety is the standard variety. Yet deviations from standard forms may not be errors of second language learners; rather, they may reflect learner choices of target varieties and reference groups (Ellis, 1994). In his ethnography of French-speaking Continental African high school students in Ontario, Ibrahim (2003) argues that the racial discourses that construct these immigrant and refugee youth as 'Black' directly influence their identification with Black North Americans and their adoption of Black Stylized English. Choosing AAE as a target variety happens not only among immigrants racialized as black but also among other immigrants of color. Southeast Asian American refugee youth, for example, may identify more with their African American peers, making AAE a more alluring target language (Bucholtz, 2004; Reyes, 2007). As for Latino ESL high school students in New York City, Goldstein (1987) finds a correlation between the amount of reported contact with African Americans and the presence of AAE grammatical features in their speech. These studies reveal how some immigrant groups travel the path of 'segmented assimilation' (Portes & Zhou, 1993), which is the acculturation to a socially and economically marginalized minority community rather than assimilation to the dominant majority. Not unlike African-American students practicing 'guerilla warfare' (Fordham, 1999), second language learners may also be uninspired to incorporate themselves into a mainstream culture that has greeted them with hostility.

Directions for Future Research

There seem to be endless areas to examine in language and ethnicity research. Based on recent scholarly trends that examine how multiple linguistic varieties operate in various learning contexts, I offer three possible

directions for building on current educational research: (1) language crossing in language learning contexts; (2) ethnic target varieties for language learners; and (3) media and popular culture in language classrooms. First, more educational research in the productive area of language crossing will continue to inform our understanding of the linguistic construction of ethnicity and ethnic boundaries, particularly with regard to teacher and student identities and classroom practice. As discussed above, most of the educational research on language crossing has so far been conducted in mainstream school settings, but there is much to be explored in language classrooms, including foreign language education (Rampton, 1999). Second, research on ethnic varieties as the target variety of language learners continues to be of pressing concern. Given the increasing global influence of hip-hop culture (Alim, 2006), more exploration in this area will offer important insights into how immigrants of color turn language learning into a symbolic site of political resistance. Finally, another growing area of research explores the role of media and popular culture in language classrooms. Several studies examine how popular cultural references may emerge in the language classroom as meaningful learning resources to students (Rymes, 2003) or as cultural models for inundating immigrants with ideas of national citizenship and consumer capitalism (Zuengler, 2003). More studies that explicitly examine the role of ethnicity are needed in this promising area of research. In all three areas, I would urge researchers to take a multi-sited ethnographic approach, which can provide rich accounts of language and ethnicity across various educational and community contexts.

Relevance to Teachers and Students

Throughout this chapter, I have tried to highlight areas that are of particular relevance to language educators. I will reiterate a few of these points in the closing of this chapter.

I would like to stress again that ethnicity is not a natural category, but a social and political construct. Histories of imbalanced power relations between groups influence the creation of ethnic categories, the formation of ethnic group experiences and the construction of ethnic stereotypes about language and behavior. Ethnic groups and boundaries are not fixed but constantly shifting in response to social and political climates. In fact, it can be quite dangerous for educators to view ethnicity in a static way. Not only can it lead to local misjudgments about student behavior, but also it can contribute to the reproduction of social inequality in education. In reviewing research on mainstream and language classrooms, this chapter revealed how schools are not neutral sites: for example only certain speech norms are assigned legitimate status more easily in the classroom; ethnic groups can be socially and linguistically stigmatized in

schools; the manipulation of linguistic features can be a strategy to avoid discrimination in the classroom; and the use of standard English by ethnic minorities can be met with disapproval by classmates. As educators, it is important not to subject students to preconceived notions about the languages, behaviors and abilities that are stereotypically associated with the ethnic groups that students may or may not even identify with.

I would also like to emphasize that there is no one-to-one correspondence between language and ethnicity. Not all members of an ethnic group speak an ethnic variety, and not all ethnic groups have an ethnic variety. For example, an ethnic variety, such as AAE, Chicano English or Native American English, can be used by both members and nonmembers of an ethnic group. Asian Americans, who have no ethnic variety but can be linked to mainstream American English, a foreign accent and nonstandard English, further complicate any natural association between language and ethnicity. In presenting a section that covered language use by ethnic group in this chapter, my goal was not to reify a link between language and ethnicity but to discuss how linguistic issues can be central to the construction of ethnic identities. An important part of this chapter presented the documented systematicity of ethnic varieties, namely AAE. This research reveals that nonstandard varieties are not laden with errors, as popular imagination would have it, but are just as grammatical as standard varieties. This knowledge is absolutely vital for teachers. When deviations from the standard are enacted by students, they may be quickly greeted with confusion, criticism and punishment. Language educators are in powerful positions to correct these judgments. Whether a student is simply complying with his or her own ethnic community norms or strategically deploying an ethnically defined convention for a particular purpose, language educators trained in sociolinguistics are the most prepared to understand the complexity of language and ethnicity in these situations.

Although many educators are already overburdened with meeting the goals of the mandated school curriculum, it would benefit both teachers and students if discussions of language and ethnicity were incorporated into the classroom. Such discussions would help educators learn about the local models of language and ethnicity that students draw on in their understanding of themselves and others. If students speak a distinct ethnic variety, design class activities to uncover the systematicity of the language. For example students could become ethnographers through group projects that document the multiple speech styles heard in the school and community. Have open class discussions and debates about language attitudes, standard English, style shifting and multilingualism. Uncover student understandings of what ethnicity is, what language is and how the two relate. Such activities could become springboards for discussing alternative conceptualizations of language and ethnicity that depart from fixed perspectives.

Suggestions for further reading

Baugh, J. (2000) *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic Pride and Racial Prejudice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
An immensely readable account of the 1996 Oakland Ebonics case, this book also focuses on how the debates that surrounded this controversial moment in history remain important to current issues in language and education.

Curtis, A. and Romney, A. (eds) (2006) *Color, Race, and English Language Teaching: Shades of Meaning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
This book is an edited collection featuring the voices of TESOL professionals of color. Authors offer accounts of their professional experiences in light of their ethnic and racial backgrounds.

Fought, C. (2006) *Language and Ethnicity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
This is the first monograph on language and ethnicity. There are several sections that focus specifically on educational issues and implications.

Kubota, R. and Lin, A.M.Y. (eds) (2009) *Race, Culture, and Identities in Second Language Education: Exploring Critically Engaged Practice*. New York: Routledge.
This edited collection of studies takes a critical perspective on the role of race and ethnicity in second language teaching and learning.

References

Alim, H.S. (2004) *You Know My Steez: An Ethnographic and Sociolinguistic Study of Styleshifting in a Black American Speech Community*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alim, H.S. (2006) *Roc the Mic Right: The Language of Hip Hop Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Au, K. (1980) Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 11 (2), 91–115.

Bailey, B. (2002) *Language, Race, and Negotiation of Identity: A Study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Barrett, R. (1999) Indexing polyphonous identity in the speech of African American drag queens. In M. Bucholtz, A.C. Liang and L.A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse* (pp. 313–331). New York: Oxford University Press.

Barth, F. (ed.) (1969) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Bartlett, L. (2007) Transnational literacies: Immigration, language learning, and identity. *Linguistics and Education* 18 (3–4), 215–231.

Basso, K.H. (1979) *Portraits of "The Whiteman": Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols Among the Western Apache*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baugh, J. (1998) Linguistics, education, and the law: Educational reform for African-American language minority students. In S.S. Mufwene, J.R. Rickford, G. Bailey and J. Baugh (eds) *African-American English: Structure, History, and Use* (pp. 282–301). New York: Routledge.

Baugh, J. (2000) *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic Pride and Racial Prejudice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bautista, M.L. (ed.) (1997) *English is an Asian Language: The Philippine Context*. Australia: Macquarie Library Pty. Ltd.

Bucholtz, M. (1995) From Mulatta to Mestiza: Passing and the linguistic reshaping of ethnic identity. In K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (eds) *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self* (pp. 351–374). New York: Routledge.

Bucholtz, M. (1999) You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4), 443–460.

Bucholtz, M. (2001) The whiteness of nerds: Superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (1), 84–100.

Bucholtz, M. (2004) Styles and stereotypes: The linguistic negotiation of identity among Laotian American youth. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3), 127–147.

Chun, E. (2001) The Construction of White, Black, and Korean American identities through African American Vernacular English. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (1), 52–64.

Coupland, N. (2001) Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society* 30, 345–75.

Curtis, A. and Romney, A. (eds) (2006) *Color, Race, and English Language Teaching: Shades of Meaning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Delpit, L. (2006) What should teachers do? Ebonics and culturally responsive instruction. In S.J. Nero (ed.) *Dialects, Englishes, Creoles, and Education* (pp. 93–101). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dillard, J.L. (1972) *Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States*. New York: Random House.

Eckert, P. (2000) *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (1994) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, F. and Shultz, J. (1982) *The Counselor as Gatekeeper: Social Interaction in Interviews*. New York: Academic Press.

Espiritu, Y.L. (1992) *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fishman, J. (1989) *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Foley, D.E. (1996) The silent Indian as a cultural production. In B.A. Levinson, D.E. Foley and D.C. Holland (eds) *The Cultural Production of the Educated Person* (pp. 79–81). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fordham, S. (1999) Dissin' "the Standard": Ebonics as Guerrilla Warfare at Capital High. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 30 (3), 272–293.

Fordham, S. and Ogbu, J. (1986) Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of acting white. *Urban Review* 18, 176–206.

Fought, C. (2003) *Chicano English in Context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers.

Fought, C. (2006) *Language and Ethnicity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gal, S. (1979) *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

Gal, S. and Irvine, J. (1995) The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research* 62 (4), 967–1001.

Gibson, M. (1988) *Accommodation without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gilroy, P. (1987) *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. London: Hutchinson.

Goddard, I. (ed.) (1996) *Languages (Handbook of North American Indians)* (Vol. 17). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Goldstein, L. (1987) Standard English: The only target for nonnative speakers of English? *TESOL Quarterly* 21 (3), 417–436.

González, N. and Arnot-Hopffer, E. (2003) Voices of the children: Language and literacy ideologies in a dual language immersion program. In S. Wortham and B. Rymes (eds) *Linguistic Anthropology of Education* (pp. 213–243). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Green, L. (2002) *African American English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. and Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982) Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In J. Gumperz (ed.) *Language and Social Identity* (pp. 22–56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, S. (1988) New ethnicities. *ICA Documents* 7, 27–31.

Hanna, D.B. (1997) Do I sound 'Asian' to you?: Linguistic markers of Asian American identity. In C. Boberg, M. Meyerhoff and S. Strassel (eds) *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* (Vol. 4 (2)), (pp. 141–153). Philadelphia: Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania.

Harklau, L. (1994) ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 241–272.

He, A.W. (2004) Identity construction in Chinese heritage language classes. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3), 199–216.

He, A.W. and Xiao, Y. (eds) (2008) *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*. National Foreign Language Resource Center. University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Heath, S.B. (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S.B. and McLaughlin, M.W. (eds) (1993) *Identity and Inner-city Youth: Beyond Ethnicity and Gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Heller, M. (1999) *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. New York: Longman.

Hewitt, R. (1986) *White Talk Black Talk: Inter-racial Friendship and Communication Amongst Adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, J.H. (1995) Mock Spanish: A site for the indexical reproduction of racism in American English. *Language and Culture Online Symposium* 2, October 1995.

Hill, J.H. (1999) Language, race, and white public space. *American Anthropologist* 100 (3), 680–689.

Holmes, J. (1997) Maori and Pakeha English: Some New Zealand social dialect data. *Language in Society* 26, 65–101.

Hornberger, N.H. (1988) *Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris Publications.

Hymes, D. (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ibrahim, A.M. (2003) "Whassup, homeboy?" Joining the African Diaspora: Black English as a symbolic site of identification and language learning. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A.F. Ball and A.K. Spears (eds) *Black Linguistics: Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas* (pp. 169–185). New York: Routledge.

Jaffe, A. (1999) *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jenkins, R. (1994) Rethinking ethnicity: Identity, categorization and power. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17, 197–223.

Jo, H. (2001) 'Heritage' language learning and ethnic identity: Korean Americans' struggle with language authorities. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 14 (1), 26–41.

Kachru, B.B. (1983) *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kang, M.A. (2004) Constructing ethnic identity through discourse: Self-categorization among Korean American camp counselors. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3), 217–234.

Kanno, Y. (2003) *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities: Japanese Returnees Betwixt Two Worlds*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kiesling, S. (2001) Stances of whiteness and hegemony in fraternity men's discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (1), 101–115.

Krauss, M. (1998) The condition of Native North American languages: The need for realistic assessment and action. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132, 9–21.

Kubota, R. and Lin, A.M.Y. (eds) (2009) *Race, Culture, and Identities in Second Language Education: Exploring Critically Engaged Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. and Harris, W.A. (1986) De facto segregation of black and white vernaculars. In D. Sankoff (ed.) *Diversity and Diachrony* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Le Page, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985) *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leap, W. (1993) *American Indian English*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Lee, S. (1996) *Unraveling the "Model Minority" Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Leung, C., Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (1997) The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 543–560.

Lin, A.M.Y. (1996) Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and code-switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education* 8, 49–84.

Lo, A. (2004) Evidentiality and morality in a Korean heritage language school. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3), 235–256.

McDermott, R. and Gospodinoff, K. (1981) Social contexts for ethnic borders and school failure. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie and K. Au (eds) *Culture and the Bilingual Classroom* (pp. 212–230). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

McKay, S. and Wong, S. (1996) Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review* 66, 577–608.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (1996) "Muy Macha": Gender and Ideology in Gang-girls' Discourse about Makeup. *Ethnos* 61 (1–2), 47–63.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008) *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice Among Latina Youth Gangs*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mendoza-Denton, N. and Iwai, M. (1993) "They speak more Caucasian": Generational differences in the speech of Japanese-Americans. In R. Queen and R. Barrett (eds) *SALSA I: Proceedings of the First Annual Symposium About Language and Society – Austin* (pp. 58–67). Austin: Department of Linguistics, University of Texas.

Mesthrie, R. (2002) *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, M.H. (1991) Indirectness and interpretation in African American women's discourse. *Pragmatics* 1 (4), 421–451.

Omi, M. and Winant, H. (1994) *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge.

Orellana, M. (1999) Good guys and "bad" girls. In M. Bucholtz, A.C. Liang and L.A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse* (pp. 64–82). New York: Oxford University Press.

Philips, S.U. (1983) *The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. New York: Longman.

Poplack, S. and Tagliamonte, S. (1989) There's no tense like the present: Verbal -s inflection in early Black English. *Language Variation and Change* 1, 47–89.

Portes, A. and Zhou, M. (1993) The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530 (November), 74–96.

Preston, D.R. (1992) Talking black and talking white: A study in variety imitation. In J.H. Hall, N. Doane and D. Ringler (eds) *Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honor of Frederic G. Cassidy* (pp. 327–355). New York: Garland.

Rahman, J. (2007) An ay for an ah: Language of survival in African American narrative comedy. *American Speech* 82 (1), 65–96.

Rampton, B. (1995) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (1999) Deutsch in Inner London and the animation of an instructed foreign language. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4), 480–504.

Reyes, A. (2007) *Language, Identity, and Stereotype Among Southeast Asian American Youth: The Other Asian*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Reyes, A. and Lo, A. (2004) Language, identity and relationality in Asian Pacific America: An introduction. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3), 115–125.

Reyes, A. and Lo, A. (eds) (2009) *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rickford, J.R. (1996) Regional and social variation. In S. McKay and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 151–194). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rickford, J.R. (1999) *African American Vernacular English: Features, Evolution, Educational Implications*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rickford, J.R. and Rickford, R.J. (2000) *Spoken Soul: The Story of Black English*. New York: Wiley.

Roth-Gordon, J. (2007) Racing and erasing the playboy: Slang, transnational youth subculture, and racial discourse in Brazil. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17 (2), 246–265.

Rymes, B. (2003) Contrasting zones of comfortable competence: Popular culture in a phonics lesson. *Linguistics and Education* 14 (3–4), 321–335.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.B.K. (1981) *Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Smitherman, G. (1981) *Black English and the Education of Black Children and Youth*. Detroit: Wayne State University Center for Black Studies Press.

Spencer, R.F. (1950) Japanese-American language behavior. *American Speech* 25 (4), 241–252.

Talmy, S. (2004) Forever FOB: The cultural production of ESL in a high school. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3), 149–172.

Tannen, D. (1981) New York Jewish conversational style. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 30, 133–149.

Taylor, H. (1989) *Standard English, Black English, and Bidialectalism*. New York: Peter Lang.

Tetreault, C. (2008) *La racaille*: Figuring gender, generation, and stigmatized space in a French *cité*. *Gender and Language* 2 (2), 141–170.

Trechter, S. and Bucholtz, M. (2001) White noise: Bringing language into whiteness studies. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (1), 3–21.

Tuan, M. (1998) *Forever Foreigners or Honorary Whites? The Asian Ethnic Experience Today*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Urciuoli, B. (1996) *Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race, and Class*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Waters, M. (1990) *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolfram, W. (1969) *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Woolard, K.A. (1989) *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Wortham, S.E.F. (2006) *Learning Identity: The Joint Emergence of Social Identification and Academic Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yamamoto, A.Y. and Zepeda, O. (2004) Native American languages. In E. Finegan and J.R. Rickford (eds) *Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 153–181). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zentella, A.C. (1997) *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zentella, A.C. (2004) Spanish in the Northeast. In E. Finegan and J.R. Rickford (eds) *Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 182–204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zuengler, J. (2003) Jackie Chan drinks Mountain Dew: Constructing cultural models of citizenship. *Linguistics and Education* 14 (3–4), 277–304.

Chapter 16
Language Socialization

PATRICIA A. DUFF

Introduction

Language socialization refers to the acquisition of linguistic, pragmatic and other cultural knowledge through social experience and is often equated with the development of cultural and communicative competence. Research in this area examines these aspects of learning and also how individuals become socialized into particular identities, worldviews or values, and ideologies as they learn language, whether it is their first language or an additional language. Thus, language socialization explores how people learn how to take part in the speech events and activities of everyday life: jokes, greetings, classroom lessons, story-telling or essay or memo writing and also the values underlying those practices. Being able to participate in language practices appropriately, according to local expectations and conventions, allows humans to function well in society.

Various definitions of language socialization exist but one that I have used draws on work by language socialization pioneers Elinor Ochs, Bambi Schieffelin and others: language socialization is 'the lifelong process by which individuals – typically novices – are inducted into specific domains of knowledge, beliefs, affect, roles, identities, and social representations, which they access and construct through language practices and social interaction . . .' (Duff, 1995: 508). One of the domains of knowledge is of course language and literacy itself. This 'induction' or socialization[1] of novices such as first- and second-language learners normally occurs through social interaction between those with more proficiency, expertise or experience in language, literacy and culture (often referred to as 'experts' or 'oldtimers'), and those with less proficiency (relative 'novices' or 'newcomers'[2]): older siblings interacting with younger siblings; teachers with students; caregivers with children; and more experienced workers with new employees in a workplace.

By saying that language socialization is a 'lifelong' process (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008), we mean that children are not the only ones being socialized into appropriate ways of using language ('Say *please, thank*